ic&l hypothesis are chiefly these that follow* First, That we have *no* idea of God, aad therefore can have no evidence of him; which argument is further flourished and descanted upon in this manner. That notion or conception of a Deity ^ that *h* commonly entertained, is nothing but a bundle of incomprehensibles, unconceivables, and impossibles ; it being only a complement of all imaginable attributes of honour, courtship, and compli- * ment, which the confounded fear and astonishment of men's minds made them huddle tap together, without any sense or philosophic truth. This seems to be intimated by a modern writer* in these words: ** The attributes of God signify not true nor false, nor any opinion of otrr brain, but the reverence arid devotion of our hearts; and therefore they are not sufficient premises to infer truth, or convince falsehood." And the same thing again is further set out, with no small pretence to wit, after this manner: " They that venture to dispute philosophically, or reason of God's nature from these attributes of honour, losing their understanding in the very first attempt, fall from one inconvenience into another, without end, and without njLimber; in the same manner, as when one, ignorant of the ceremonies of court, comiteg into the presence of a greater person than he is used to speak to, and stumbling at his entrance, to save himself from falling, lets slip his cloak, to recover his cloak lets fall his hat, and with one disorder after another, discovers his astonishment and rusticity," The meaning of which, and other like passages of the same writer, seems to be this; that the attributes of God (by which his nature

* Hobbes.